

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CARLA JACKSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:24-cv-01565-SAB

**ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO
SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS
SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED FOR
FAILURE TO FILE OPENING BRIEF**

FIVE DAY DEADLINE

On December 19, 2024, Plaintiff Carla Jackson filed this action seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner”) denying an application for disability benefits pursuant to the Social Security Act. (ECF No. 1.) On December 20, 2024, the Court issued a scheduling order. (ECF No. 5.) Pursuant to the scheduling order, Plaintiff’s opening brief was due 30 days after the filing of the administrative record. (*Id.* at 2.) The administrative record was lodged on February 18, 2025 (ECF No. 11); thus, Plaintiff’s opening brief was due by March 20, 2025. However, neither an opening brief nor request for extension of time have been submitted.

Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action. Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir.

1 2000).

2 Plaintiff's failure to timely file the opening brief, or seek an extension to do so,
3 constitutes a failure to comply with the Court's order. Accordingly, Plaintiff will be directed to
4 show cause why sanctions should not issue for failure to file the opening brief in compliance
5 with the Court's December 20, 2024 scheduling order.

6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **within five (5) days of entry of**
7 **this order**, Plaintiff shall show cause in writing why sanctions should not issue for the failure to
8 comply with the Court's scheduling order (ECF No. 5). Plaintiff is advised that filing an opening
9 brief without showing cause in writing why sanctions should not issue is an insufficient response
10 to this order. Failure to comply with this order will result in the imposition of sanctions up to
11 and including dismissal of this action.

12
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: March 21, 2025



15 STANLEY A. BOONE
United States Magistrate Judge

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28